



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,725	12/19/2001	Heather Maria Hinton	AUS920010769US1	2138

45993 7590 03/21/2005

IBM CORPORATION (RHF)
C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ
P. O. BOX 23324
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123

EXAMINER

GILLIS, BRIAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,725

Applicant(s)

HINTON ET AL.

Examiner

Brian Gillis

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "31" has been used to designate both B and "user's browser extracts and stores home domain CIDC, forwards message to affiliated domain". Also, reference character "48" has been used to designate both "Participate in e-community" and "Access Denied". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 102 and 105. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be

Art Unit: 2141

labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 10 recite the limitation "said protected resource" in line 17 of claim 1 and line 18 of claim 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grandcolas et al (EPO Application #1089516) in view of Lerner (US PG PUB #2002/0010776).

Claims 1 and 10 disclose a method and computer readable medium for allowing an Internet or intranet browser user to transfer directly to a domain that is participating in an e-community without repetitious and redundant authentication actions, said e-community comprising a plurality of affiliated domain servers, said user being properly registered and authenticated to a home domain server within said e-community.

Grandcolas et al teaches of enrolling a user at an affiliated domain, vouching for the identity of the user and building a local session at the affiliated domain for the user (paragraph 16, lines 7-13, paragraph 32, lines 12-17, paragraph 22, lines 18-19, paragraph 37, lines 41-44). It fails to teach of transmitting a cookie from the affiliated domain server to the browser and recording successful authentication of said user into said affiliated domain. Lerner teaches of a cookie being passed from the client's web browser to a web application and having data written into the cookie as it is passed (paragraph 38, lines 6-11, paragraph 39, lines 1-3).

Grandcolas et al and Lerner are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cookie passing in Lerner with the authentication method of Grandcolas et al because this allows a company to meet a user's demand by offering more customized services to the user (paragraph 8, lines 6-8).

Claims 2 and 11 disclose the method and computer readable medium in claims 1 and 10 with steps of enrolling the user in an affiliated domain. Grandcolas et al teaches of transmitting a home domain cookie and enrollment request, redirecting the enrollment

Art Unit: 2141

request, updating user information at the home domain for a server kept record, and modifying the home domain cookie to have a user kept record (paragraph 30, lines 3-4, paragraph 31, lines 5-7, paragraph 40, lines 11-18). It fails to teach of transmitting an affiliated domain cookie to the user's browser and redirecting the enrollment response with a success indicator to the home domain server. Lerner teaches of a cookie being transmitted from a browser to an application and having an enrollment success indicator returned from an application interface library to a client browser, which also could store it (paragraph 63, lines 1-11, 23-27).

Grandcolas et al and Lerner are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cookie transmitting in Lerner with the enrollment method of Grandcolas et al because a user is capable of logging on once and with the extra data that can be transmitted back each application visited can shape prompts or other content based on this collected information (paragraph 70, lines 10-20).

Claims 3, 4, 12, and 13 disclose the method and computer readable medium as set forth in claims 2 and 11 wherein said step of redirecting said enrollment request and enrollment success indicator comprises performing a hyper text transfer protocol (HTTP) redirection operation. Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner teaches of all the limitations of claims 2 and 11 as cited above. It fails to teach of using a HTTP redirection operation. Lerner further teaches of using a HTTP redirect command, which is used to redirect information to a client web browser (paragraph 63, lines 27-34).

Lerner and Grandcolas et al are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the redirect command in Lerner with the enrollment method of Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner because small amounts of user information can be stored and moved for authentication processes in the distributed systems (paragraph 37, lines 17-21).

Claims 6 and 15 disclose the step of vouching in the method and computer readable medium of claims 1 and 10. Grandcolas et al teaches of enrolling a user at an affiliated domain, vouching for the identity of the user and building a local session at the affiliated domain for the user as recited in claim 1 and also teaches of transferring the cookie, decoding a cookie which can provide the location of where to send a vouch for request, sending a request from the web server to the customer using redirect and returning a vouch response to the server by via the client using redirection (paragraph 16, lines 7-13, paragraph 30, lines 1-4, paragraph 31, lines 5-6, paragraph 32, lines 12-17, paragraph 22, lines 18-19, paragraph 37, lines 41-44). It fails to teach of transmitting a cookie from the affiliated domain server to the browser and recording successful authentication of said user into said affiliated domain. Lerner teaches of a cookie being passed from the client's web browser to a web application and having data written into the cookie as it is passed (paragraph 38, lines 6-11, paragraph 39, lines 1-3).

Grandcolas et al and Lerner are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cookie passing in Lerner with the authentication method of Grandcolas et al because this allows a company to meet a user's demand by offering more customized services to the user (paragraph 8, lines 6-8).

Claims 7 and 16 disclose the step of sending a vouch-for request in the method and computer readable medium of claims 6 and 15. Grandcolas et al teaches of enrolling a user at an affiliated domain, vouching for the identity of the user and building a local session at the affiliated domain for the user as recited in claim 1 and also teaches of verifying the cookie, which can contain necessary location information (paragraph 16, lines 7-13, paragraph 25, lines 15-16, paragraph 32, lines 12-17, paragraph 33, lines 18-19, paragraph 37, lines 41-44). It fails to teach of transmitting a cookie from the affiliated domain server to the browser and recording successful authentication of said user into said affiliated domain. Lerner teaches of a cookie being passed from the client's web browser to a web application and having data written into the cookie as it is passed (paragraph 38, lines 6-11, paragraph 39, lines 1-3).

Grandcolas et al and Lerner are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cookie passing in Lerner with the authentication method of

Grandcolas et al because this allows a company to meet a user's demand by offering more customized services to the user (paragraph 8, lines 6-8).

Claims 8, 9, 17, and 18 disclose the steps of sending a vouch-for request and returning a vouch-for response in the method and computer readable medium of claims 6 and 15. Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner teaches of all the limitations of claims 6 and 15 as cited above. It fails to teach of using a HTTP redirection operation. Lerner further teaches of using a HTTP redirect command, which is used to redirect information to a client web browser (paragraph 63, lines 27-34).

Lerner and Grandcolas et al are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the redirect command in Lerner with the enrollment method of Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner because small amounts of user information can be stored and moved for authentication processes in the distributed systems (paragraph 37, lines 17-21).

Claim 19 discloses a system for e-community enrollment by an Internet or intranet user using cross-domain single-sign-on to a domain that is participating in an e-community without repetitious and redundant authentication actions, said e-community comprising a plurality of affiliated domain servers, said user being properly registered and authenticated to a home domain server within said e-community. Grandcolas et al teaches of a home and affiliated domain cookie accompanying an enrollment request and response, and a vouch-for request and response (paragraph 16, lines 7-13,

Art Unit: 2141

paragraph 32, lines 12-17, and paragraph 33, lines 18-19). Claim 23 discloses the system of claim 19 further comprising an affiliated domain cookie evaluator.

Grandcolas et al teaches of verifying the cookie, which can contain necessary location information (paragraph 25, lines 15-16, paragraph 33, lines 18-19). It fails to teach of a cookie receivable by a browser to record successful authentication of a user. Lerner teaches of a cookie being passed from the client's web browser to a web application and having data written into the cookie as it is passed (paragraph 38, lines 6-11, paragraph 39, lines 1-3).

Grandcolas et al and Lerner are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cookie passing in Lerner with the authentication method of Grandcolas et al because this allows a company to meet a user's demand by offering more customized services to the user (paragraph 8, lines 6-8).

Claim 20 discloses the system as set forth in claim 19 further comprising: an enrollment request redirector, an enrollment response redirector, a user information manager, and a home domain identity cookie modifier. Grandcolas et al teaches of an enrollment request indicator, a user information manager, and a home domain identity cookie modifier (paragraph 30, lines 3-4, paragraph 31, lines 5-7, paragraph 40, lines 11-18). It fails to teach of an enrollment response redirector. Lerner teaches of a cookie being transmitted from a browser to an application and having an enrollment

Art Unit: 2141

success indicator returned from an application interface library to a client browser, which also could store it (paragraph 63, lines 1-11, 23-27).

Grandcolas et al and Lerner are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the cookie transmitting in Lerner with the enrollment method of Grandcolas et al because a user is capable of logging on once and with the extra data that can be transmitted back each application visited can shape prompts or other content based on this collected information (paragraph 70, lines 10-20).

Claims 21 and 22 disclose the system as set forth in claim 20 wherein said enrollment request and response redirector comprises a HTTP command. Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner teaches of all the limitations of claim 20 as cited above. It fails to teach of using a HTTP redirection operation. Lerner further teaches of using a HTTP redirect command, which is used to redirect information to a client web browser (paragraph 63, lines 27-34).

Lerner and Grandcolas et al are analogous art because they are both related to single sign on methods.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the redirect command in Lerner with the enrollment method of Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner because small amounts of user information can be stored and moved for authentication processes in the distributed systems (paragraph 37, lines 17-21).

Claims 5, 14, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grandcolas et al (EPO Application #1089516) in view of Lerner (US PG PUB #2002/0010776) as applied to claims 1-4, 6-13, and 15-22 and 24 above, and further in view of Kopsell et al (US PG PUB #2002/0078192).

Claims 5 and 14 disclose the step of modifying said home domain identity cookie of the method and computer readable medium of claims 2 and 11. Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner teaches of modifying the said home domain identity cookie to record enrollment success. It fails to teach of modifying extensible data in the cookie to include a symbol indicating successful enrollment.

Kopsell et al teaches of a cookie, which has a plurality of data fields, which can be modified for various reasons (paragraph 25, lines 19-37).

Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner and Kopsell et al are analogous art because they are both related to exchanging cookies in a client-server environment.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use cookie modification in Kopsell et al with the method of Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner because this data can help form a meaningful pattern of activities of the user and preferences can be deduced (paragraph 5, lines 19-22).

Claim 23 discloses the system as set forth claim 20 wherein said home domain identity cookie modifier is adapted to modify extensible data in the home domain identity cookie to include a symbol indicating successful enrollment at said affiliated domain server.

Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner teaches of modifying the said home domain identity cookie to record enrollment success. It fails to teach of modifying extensible data in the cookie to include a symbol indicating successful enrollment.

Kopsell et al teaches of a cookie, which has a plurality of data fields, which can be modified for various reasons (paragraph 25, lines 19-37).

Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner and Kopsell et al are analogous art because they are both related to exchanging cookies in a client-server environment.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use cookie modification in Kopsell et al with the method of Grandcolas et al as modified by Lerner because this data can help form a meaningful pattern of activities of the user and preferences can be deduced (paragraph 5, lines 19-22).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Le Berre (EPO Application #0940960) teaches of authentication between servers. Verma (US PG PUB #2003/0037131) teaches of user information across multiple domains. Callaghan et al (US PG PUB #2002/0007317) teaches of sharing state information across domains. Vange et al (US PG PUB #2002/0056006) teaches of transmitting packets from a computer onto a network. Vange et al (US PG PUB #2002/0023159) teaches of managing state information between processes in different domains. MacNaughton et al (US Patent #5,796,393) teaches of integrating an on-line service community with a foreign service. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian

Art Unit: 2141


Gillis whose telephone number is 571-272-7952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:45-4:15.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian Gillis
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

BJG


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER